

Message

From: Swenson, Daniel P SPL [Daniel.P.Swenson@usace.army.mil]
Sent: 7/18/2014 10:43:33 PM
To: Amato, Paul [Amato.Paul@epa.gov]
CC: Allen, Aaron O SPL [Aaron.O.Allen@usace.army.mil]; McGuffie, Brianne E SPL [Brianne.E.McGuffie@usace.army.mil]; Pankratz, Shannon L SPL [Shannon.L.Pankratz@usace.army.mil]
Subject: RE: Petersen Ranch Response to Comments Letter (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

Paul, We don't necessarily have to delay the prospectus; we can discuss this after the BEI has been submitted. Thanks, Dan

-----Original Message-----

From: Amato, Paul [mailto:Amato.Paul@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 18, 2014 3:15 PM
To: Swenson, Daniel P SPL
Cc: Allen, Aaron O SPL; McGuffie, Brianne E SPL; Pankratz, Shannon L SPL
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Petersen Ranch Response to Comments Letter (UNCLASSIFIED)

Hi Dan,

I'm fine to wait but do know that the sponsor was planning to submit the Draft BEI by the end of next week or early the following week so we would potentially hold them up unless this issue is somehow easily resolved. I'll let you all decide how you want to schedule it and appreciate the willingness to talk through this more.

Paul

Paul F. Amato
Environmental Protection Specialist
Wetlands Regulatory Office
U.S. EPA, Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street, WTR-8
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901
t:(415) 972-3847
f:(415) 947-8026
e:amato.paul@epa.gov

From: Swenson, Daniel P SPL [mailto:Daniel.P.Swenson@usace.army.mil]
Sent: Friday, July 18, 2014 3:11 PM
To: Amato, Paul
Cc: Allen, Aaron O SPL; McGuffie, Brianne E SPL; Pankratz, Shannon L SPL
Subject: RE: Petersen Ranch Response to Comments Letter (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

Paul, I'll be out all next week, but I would like to participate on this call. Could it wait until the following week? Thanks, Dan

From: Amato, Paul [mailto:Amato.Paul@epa.gov]

Sent: Friday, July 18, 2014 2:59 PM

To: Nate Bello; Markham, John W SPL; Allen, Aaron O SPL; McGuffie, Brianne E SPL; Swenson, Daniel P SPL; Tim DeGraff; Julie Vandermost; Shawn Gatchel-Hernandez; Tracey Brownfield
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Petersen Ranch Response to Comments Letter

I looked at the letter and have no major issues with the responses. I will reserve my comments on the service area for later, as discussed.

I looked over the development plan and the JD and have the following concerns:

1. For the JD at the Elizabeth Lake property, why was the incised channel that connects DW-2 to DW-3 not counted as jurisdictional? Since this is a section of the channel that conveys flows from the watershed above the dam down to the valley floor and Lake, it seems to me that it would be jurisdictional.

2. For the Elizabeth Lake property development plan, there are four new alluvial fan areas proposed for restoration that were not included in the Prospectus so this is actually a lot of new information to consider. Three of the fans are currently identified on the JD as short single thread channels. The channel flowing to the most eastern fan is not even identified on the JD. However, after re-establishment and rehab work, the amount of 404 acreage proposed is a huge increase. I continue to have concerns over how these credits would be used to offset impacts to aquatic resources without there being a net loss of area and whether the proposed re-establishment and rehab work would provide enough functional gain across the entire fan to justify including all of the acreage towards credits. I understand the importance of providing available credits for impacts to alluvial fan resources but my concerns remain.

I would like to follow up with a call to the Corps early next week to get clarity on these issues and follow up with the rest of the group shortly after that.

Thanks,

Paul

Paul F. Amato

Environmental Protection Specialist

Wetlands Regulatory Office

U.S. EPA, Region 9

75 Hawthorne Street, WTR-8

San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

t:(415) 972-3847

f:(415) 947-8026

e:amato.paul@epa.gov

From: Nate Bello [mailto:bello@wra-ca.com]

Sent: Tuesday, July 15, 2014 3:43 PM

To: Markham, John W SPL; Aaron Allen; McGuffie, Brianne E SPL; daniel.p.swenson@usace.army.mil
<mailto:daniel.p.swenson@usace.army.mil>; Amato, Paul; Tim DeGraff; Julie Vandermost; Shawn Gatchel-Hernandez; Tracey Brownfield
Subject: Petersen Ranch Response to Comments Letter

Hi all,

I briefly reviewed our response letter for items that could require significant changes to the BEI should there be any disagreements. There are two topics that would be particularly helpful to have the Corps agreement on in advance:

1. The changes that were made to the delineation following the verification visit are included in Attachment 2 of the letter. We intended to make all of the changes requested by the CORPS, if there are any additional changes needed, it would be helpful to know as soon as possible.

2. The proposed restoration plans are included in Attachment 7 of the letter. If the IRT has any issue with components of these plans it could change the contents of the Development Plan and crediting evaluations.

Thank you all for being willing to provide early comments on these components, and feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Nate

NATHAN BELLO | Conservation Biologist/Planner | o: 415.454.8868 x 180 | c: 916.508.4993 | bello@wra-ca.com <mailto:bello@wra-ca.com>

WRA, Inc. | www.wra-ca.com <<http://www.wra-ca.com/>> | 2169-G East Francisco Blvd., San Rafael, CA 94901
| San Diego | Fort Bragg | Denver

WRA is open for consulting in San Diego and Denver.

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE